REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 21, 2005.

No claims are amended. Claims 1-23 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-16 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipation by Henrikson (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,673, published July 13, 1999). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as the reference does not show each and every element of the invention as claimed.

The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP § 2131. Although, during examination the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow, that interpretation must be tempered by the context in which the term is used. The court in Hyatt stated that "during examination proceedings, claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added) ("During examination proceedings, claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." ; citing In re Graves, 69 F.3d 1147, 1152, 36 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1697, 1701 (Fed. Cir. 1995); In re Etter, 756 F.2d 852, 858, 225 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 1, 5 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (en banc).).

The Office Action purports to give a broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. The interpretations given are respectfully traversed, as they are not believed reasonable in light of the claim language and specification. Further, Henrikson does not describe the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1, describes using a text file to identify function code formats, and calculate values for fields of a frame based on the function code formats. The Office Action indicates that Henrikson uses "a text file to identify function code formats at Col. 5, lines 11-25, where providing the user choices would involve some text based user readable file that is then used to indicate a function code for related events)" The cited language only describes the use of a user

interface to allow the user to select trigger events, and select captured data for display and storage. There is no identification of function code formats as claimed, nor use of a text file to identify them. First, the Office Action uses the phrase "would involve some text based user readable file..." The language "would involve" is very weak, at best implying inherency or official notice. Neither has been properly established. Second, trigger events are not the same as function code formats. Function code formats describe the format of fields in a frame as such term is used in the claim and described in the specification. They help a user understand what the captured frame information means without having to resort to a manual to decode the frames. Henrikson simply does not use a text file in the same manner as that described in claim 1. Since Henrikson lacks at least one element of claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action also indicates that Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-47 describe "...digital codes indicate events to be captured by filters that then calculate field values)." This assertion is respectfully traversed. The cited language makes no reference to the calculation of field values. In fact, the cited language of Henrikson merely indicates that the filter is used to capture response retry timeout errors, and capture the error transmission and bytes after such transmission. No calculation of values for fields is mentioned or implied. Thus, even an overly broad interpretation of the claim language is not met by Henrikson, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In the response to arguments section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that "Henrikson discloses the creation of filters based upon the selected events, or function code formats selected from the text list (Henrikson, col. 56, lines 29-47). These filters are interpreted to be the fields of the currently claimed invention. They are calculated based upon the function code formats provided by the user selections mentioned above." These statements are difficult for Applicant and one of average skill in the art to understand. In Henrikson, a filter is not calculated, but rather is selected or specified. A filter does not calculate in Henrikson, it is merely used to identify data, such as the response retry timeout errors, which are then captured. It is also believed unreasonable to interpret filters as fields of a frame. No one of average skill in the art would do so.

Claim 2 recites providing the values of the fields to a display. The Office Action indicates that Henrikson does so at col. 5, lines 57-59. Since the values in claim 2 are calculated,

and Henrikson does not describe the calculation of values, no such values are provided by Henrikson, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 further describes matching a value in the frame to a verbal description from the text file. This further illustrates one purpose of the presently claimed invention. One purpose is to provide explanations of fields to users so a user does not have to resort to a user manual to interpret bus traffic. Henrikson, by using filters, approaches analysis from a different angle, that of trying to cull out specific traffic identified by the filters. It does not use text files to explain about fields in frames, but uses a menu to help select filters to capture desired bus traffic. This is a completely different approach to monitoring bus traffic, and the claims clearly distinguish from Henrikson by providing descriptions about particular fields of a selected frame.

Claims 10-23 provide further even more details about how information is provided to help a user interpret fields or records in a frame. Claims 10-23 specifically refer to using an interpretation file, and the provision of a user viewable interpretation of the frame by using records in the interpretation file. The Examiner states that Henrikson discloses a system for interpreting packets on a process control bus. This statement is respectfully traversed. Henrikson captures communications. It does not help with interpreting packets, but allows a user to analyze and record the data communications. The present invention as claimed in claims 10-23, actually provides a viewable interpretation of the frame.

The Office Action indicates that Henrikson discloses an interpretation file at col. 5, lines 11-25, "where trigger selections and associated digital data act as an interpretation file". An interpretation file, as understood to those of skill in the art aid in interpretation of information as described on page 16, lines 8-9 of the present application: "interpretation for the frames that are moving on the bus." Again, Henrikson does not describe anything regarding interpretation of frames.

The Examiner also equates trigger selections and associated digital data to an interpretation file. This is believed an unreasonably broad interpretation of both the elements of Henrikson and the current claim language. The Examiner is requested to provide a reference supporting such interpretations, as it is believed outside the interpretation of one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, the Examiner indicates that Henrikson at col. 5, lines 35-49 provides a user viewable interpretation of the frame. This is respectfully traversed. The claim language appears

to be taken outside the context of the application, and ignores the meaning of the interpretation file and a viewable interpretation of the frame. Such an interpretation describes the fields of the frame in a manner that saves a user from having to resort to a manual to decode the meaning of the fields and values within the fields of frames.

It is noted that the office action indicates several instances of inherency. Each of these is traversed, as none establish that the inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teaching.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 373-6972 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SREEKANTH VOLETI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6972

Date 6-14-2005

By _____
Bradley A. Forrest
Reg. No. 30,837

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 14th day of June, 2005.

Dawn M. Poole
Name

Dawn M. Poole
Signature